DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 420 698 TM 028 373

AUTHOR Murphy, Joseph; Shipman, Neil
TITLE The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium: A Standards-Based Approach to Strengthening Educational Leadership.
PUB DATE 1998-04-00
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Diego, CA, April 13-17, 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; Administrators; *Educational Administration; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; *Instructional Leadership; Learning; School Culture; *Standards
IDENTIFIERS *Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium

ABSTRACT

The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), under the auspices of the Council of Chief State School Officers, and in cooperation with the National Policy Board for Educational Administration, developed a framework for redefining school leadership through standards for educational leaders. This paper describes the central elements of the ISLLC design for educational leadership and provides a preliminary look at systemic leadership in action, starting with a description of the infrastructure that supports the ISLLC's work. The changing environment surrounding schooling and postindustrial conceptions of education are considered. The third section of this paper translates the ISLLC understanding of educational leadership into a set of standards that can be used to strengthen school leadership throughout the educational system. The final section discusses early progress in connecting the standards for strategies for creating effective school leaders. The standards that emerged are for a school administrator who: (1) facilitates the development, implementation, and stewardship of learning shared by the school community; (2) promotes the success of all students through a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning; (3) promotes the success of all through ensuring management, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment; (4) promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner; and (5) promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. Ways in which these standards are being implemented are discussed. (Contains 31 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 420 698

The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium: A Standards-Based Approach to Strengthening Educational Leadership

Joseph Murphy

Vanderbilt University

and

Neil Shipman

The Council of Chief State School Officers

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the

American Educational Research Association

April 1998

San Diego

TM028373

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Neil Shipman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

While the early to mid-1980s barrage of reform reports left school educational administration largely unscathed, ideas about strengthening leadership are beginning to occupy an increasingly important place in many educational reform portfolios. Indeed, since the release of the 1987 report of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, Leaders for America's Schools, considerable attention has been devoted to finding ways to improve the quality of leadership in our schools and school systems. To date, a good deal of this energy has been focused on restructuring the training programs that prepare educators for formal leadership positions, generally via a state licensure system. Other initiatives have acknowledged the need to create much stronger networks of professional development for school leaders.

Until recently, however, systemic efforts designed to rebuild the leadership infrastructure of schooling have been conspicuous by their absence. In the mid-1990s, with the establishment of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) the tide began to turn. ISLLC has brought together many of the major parties with a stake in educational leadership--the states (currently 30), the relevant professional associations, and the universities. Under the auspices of the Council of Chief State School Officers (where our sister organization, the Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium [INTASC], is housed) and in cooperation with the National Policy Board for Educational Administration, ISLLC set out to develop a powerful framework for redefining school leadership and to marshall the forces necessary to bring that design to life.

In the remaining sections of the paper, we describe the central elements of the ISLLC design and provide a preliminary snapshot of systemic leadership reform in action. We begin by revealing the infrastructure that supports our work.[1] We analyze both the changing environment surrounding schooling and the evolving postindustrial conceptions of education. We then unpack the conception of leadership that rests on these foundations. In the third section, we translate our understanding of leadership into a set of standards that can be used to strengthen school leadership throughout the educational system. In the final section of the paper, we discuss early progress in connecting the standards to strategies for creating effective school leaders.

Foundations

The model of leadership one develops depends a good deal on how the design issue is framed. The Consortium tackled this task by constructing an ideological scaffolding that heavily influenced the shape that our understanding of leadership would take--and subsequently the standards that would animate that understanding. This infrastructure was built from two bodies of information: the changing environment in which education operates and knowledge about appropriate models of schooling for the 21st century.

The Changing Nature of the Educational Environment

As has been the case throughout our history, the forces propelling the reformation of schooling and the redefinition of leadership today are located primarily in the educational environment--in the web of economic, social, and political dynamics in which the educational system is ensconced. Each of these dynamics became a part of the infrastructure supporting the Consortium's understanding of leadership for tomorrow's schools.

Economic Forces

Over the last 15 years, the defining element of the economic environment for schooling has changed--from a sense of crises in the economy and from a sense of deterioration of the nation's well-being that dominated the reform reports of the 1980s to a focus on preparedness for the global economy of the 21st century.

One side of the problem discussed by critics is the belief that systems that hold steady in today's world are actually in decline. While others see stability, these critics see "increasing obsolescence of the education provided by most U.S. schools" (Murnane & Levy, 1996, p. 6). The other side of the productivity issue raised by these reviewers is the claim that because of the changing nature of the economy, as outlined above, the level of outcomes students need to reach must be significantly increased.

> Today's schools look much like Ford in 1926. The products they produce--student achievement levels--are not worse than they were 20 years ago; in most respects they are slightly better. But in those 20 years, the job market has changed radically. Just as the Model T that was good enough in 1921 was not good enough in 1926, the education that was adequate for high-wage employers in 1970 is no longer adequate today. (Murnane & Levy, 1996, p. 77)

They find that the schools are not meeting this new standard for productivity. They argue that "American schools are not providing students with the learning that they will need to function effectively in the 21st Century" (Consortium on Productivity in the Schools, 1995, p. 3). The press to redefine the educational system to address these concerns is palpable.

Social Forces

The Consortium's understanding of education for the 21st century and of the types of leaders needed for tomorrow's schools was also formed by the documented need to address the changing social dynamics of American society and to repair an ever widening tear in the social fabric of the nation. The first issue is concerned with a reweaving of the social fabric--with demographic shifts that threaten "our national standard of living and democratic foundations" (Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1989, p. 27) and promise to overwhelm schools as they are now constituted. Minority enrollment in U.S. schools is rising, as is the proportion of less advantaged youngsters. There is a rapid increase in the number of students whose primary language is other than English. The traditional two-parent family, with one parent employed and the other at home to care for the children, has become an anomaly, constituting only one quarter of U.S. families.

The second force might best be described as an unraveling of the social fabric. The number of social ills confronting society appears to be expanding exponentially. Ever increasing numbers of families are falling into poverty. As the gap between the rich and poor grows, many are sinking even deeper into poverty. Children are disproportionately represented among the ranks of the poor, and the number of children in poverty--currently one in five--continues to grow. At the same time, we are bombarded with news of alarming increases in measure of dysfunctions and ill health among youth and their families: unemployment, unwanted pregnancies, alcohol and drug abuse, and violence. Indexes of physical, mental, and moral well-being are declining. The stock of social capital is decreasing as well.

As with the economy, analysts believe that schools offer a solution strategy to confront these forces and to alleviate accompanying problems. Once again, there is considerable pressure to address environmental dynamics by reshaping the educational system and by redefining the roles and responsibilities of the women and men who lead America's schools.

Political Forces

At the same time, new bundles of ideas are emerging in the political environment that are both fueling and shaping our understandings of schooling and leadership. One of the key elements involves a recalibration of the locus of control based on a reconfiguration of functions among levels of government. Originally called "democratic localism," it has more recently come to be known simply as localization or, more commonly, as decentralization. However it is labeled, it represents a backlash against centralized and bureaucratic forms of education organizations. A second emerging political force can best be thought of as a recasting of democracy, a replacement of representative governance with more populist conceptions, especially direct democracy. A third shift encompasses a rebalancing of the governance equation in favor of lay citizens while diminishing the power of the state and (in some ways) educational professionals. This line of ideas emphasizes parental empowerment by recognizing their historic rights in the lives of their children. Choice is a fourth element of the reconfigured political environment, one that shares a good deal of space with the concepts of localism, direct democracy, and lay control. Finally, it seems likely that something that might best be thought of as democratic professionalism will form a central part of the infrastructure of the political landscape in the postindustrial world. What this means is

the gradual decline of control by elite professionals--by professional managers and more recently by teacher unions--that characterized education for most of the twentieth century.

The Changing Nature of Education

Turning to education and schooling, Consortium members discerned three significant trends, one at each level of the educational system--the technical core, the managerial level, and the institutional level.

Technical Core

To begin with, there is some evidence that a more robust understanding of the education production function is beginning to be translated into new ways of thinking about learning and teaching. The strongest theoretical and disciplinary influence on education--behavioral psychology--is being pushed off center stage by constructivist psychology and newer sociological perspectives on learning. This shift toward "research on cognition as a basis for understanding how people learn casts an entirely different perspective on how the schooling process should be redesigned" (Hutchins, 1988, p. 47). Underlying this change are radically different ways of thinking about the educability of children. Those who are at the forefront of transforming schools that were historically organized to produce results consistent with the normal curve, to sort youth into the various strata needed to fuel the economy, see education being transformed to ensure equal opportunity for all learners.

At the center of this newly forming vision about schooling for tomorrow are fairly radical changes in assumptions about intelligence and knowledge. The prevailing conception of knowledge--the view that "knowledge can be assumed to be an external entity existing independently of human thought and action, and hence, something about which one can be

objective" (Fisher, 1990, p. 82)--"dominant for so long in classroom practice, has begun to be critically examined in a new way" (p. 84). A new view, one that holds that knowledge is internal and subjective, that it "depends on the values of the persons working with it and the context within which that work is conducted" (p. 82), is receiving serious consideration. Thus, the new educational design considers "knowledge not as somehow in the possession of the teacher, waiting to be transmitted to the student or to be used to treat the students' problems, but as mutually constructed by teacher and student in order to make sense of human experience" (Petrie, 1990, pp. 17-18). Learning is seen as a social phenomenon and considerable attention is devoted to the social origins of cognition.

New views about what is worth learning characterize emerging perspectives on schooling for the 21st century. The traditional emphasis on acquiring information is being replaced by a focus on learning to learn and on the ability to use knowledge. New perspectives on the context of learning are also being developed, directing attention to active learning. A century-old concern for independent work and competition--a focus on the individual dimension of human existence, especially on individual ability--is slowly receding in favor of more cooperative learning relationships--a focus on the social dimensions of human existence.

New ways of thinking about learning are also emerging on postindustrial organizations. Vigorous attacks on the practice of tracking are accompanied by calls for a core curriculum for all students. Reformers involved in the redesign of education are also tackling the traditional emphasis in schools in content coverage, rote learning of basic skills, and reliance on textbooks as the primary source of knowledge. They promulgate an alternative image of a

core technology that (a) reflects an interdisciplinary vision, (b) features a curriculum that is more vertical and less horizontal--that covers fewer topics in more depth, (c) highlights higher-order thinking skills for all students, (d) spotlights the use of technology and original source documents in lieu of textbooks, (e) underscores the use of a broadened evaluation system that highlights authentic measures of assessment, and (f) pushes service learning to center stage.

In schools of the postindustrial era, a learner-centered pedagogy replaces the more traditional model of teacher-centered instruction. The model of the teacher as sage on a stage, in which instructors are viewed as content specialists who possess relevant knowledge that they transmit to students through telling, is replaced by an approach in which teaching is more of a guiding function. The student becomes the primary actor. Substantive conversation replaces conventional classroom talk and didactic instruction. Analysts believe that in the 21st century, schools will be conceived of as knowledge work organizations, learning will be seen as the construction of understanding, and teaching will be viewed as facilitating this development. Students are seen as "producers of knowledge" and teachers "as managers of learning experiences" (Hawley, 1989, p. 23). The focus in on learning, not on the delivery system.

Managerial Level

In recent years, reformers have also begun to call into question the operant organizational and management models and structures of America's schools. There is a growing sentiment that the existing administrative structure is failing, that the reformers of the last century have produced "bureaucratic arteriosclerosis, insulation from parents and patrons,

and the low productivity of a declining industry protected as a quasi monopoly" (Tyack, 1993, p. 3). It is increasingly being concluded that the existing bureaucratic system of administration is incapable of addressing the problems of the public education system.

In particular, the current bureaucratic system of management and governance has come under sharp criticism from: (1) those who argue that schools are so c[illegible]ed with bureaucratic sediment that initiative, creativity, and professional judgement have all been paralyzed and the likely success of reforms has been neutralized; (2) critics who maintain that the "bureaucratic management practices have been causing unacceptable distortions in educational process" (Wise, 1989, p. 301), that they are paralyzing American education and interfering with learning; (3) analysts who believe that bureaucracy is counterproductive to the needs and interests of educators within the schools; (4) critics who suggest that bureaucratic management is inconsistent with the sacred values and purposes of education, who question "fundamental ideological issues pertaining to bureaucracy's meaning in a democratic society" (Campbell et al., 1987, p. 73); (5) scholars who view bureaucracy as a form of operation that inherently forces attention away from the core technology of schooling; (6) reform proponents who hold that the existing organizational structure of schools is neither sufficiently flexible nor sufficiently robust to meet the needs of students in a postindustrial society; and (7) analysts who believe that the rigidities of bureaucracy impede the ability of parents and citizens to govern and reform schooling.

This tremendous attack on the bureaucratic infrastructure of schools has led to demands to develop alternative methods of operating that are grounded on new values and principles. Concomitantly, new forms of school organization and management are emerging.

The basic organizing and management principles of schooling are giving way to more proactive attempts to govern educational systems. In addition, a new "social physics" (Bell, cited in Campbell et al., 1987, p. 26) that promises to significantly change the nature of social relationships in schools is emerging. The hierarchical, bureaucratic organizational structures that have defined schools over the past 80 years are giving way to more decentralized and more professionally controlled systems that create new designs for school management. In these new postindustrial organizations, there are important shifts in roles, relationships, and responsibilities: traditional patterns of relationships are altered, authority flows are less hierarchical, role definitions are both more general and more flexible, leadership is connected to competence for needed tasks rather than to formal position, and independence and isolation are replaced by cooperative work. Furthermore, a traditional structural orientation is being overshadowed by a focus on the human element. The operant goal is no longer maintenance of the organizational infrastructure but rather the development of human resources. Developing learning climates and organizational adaptivity are being substituted for the more traditional emphasis on uncovering and applying the one best model of performance. The changed metaphors being applied to these restructured schools, e.g., from principal as manager to principal as facilitator, from teacher as worker to teacher as leader, nicely portray these fundamental revisions in our understanding of social relationships and in our views of organizations and conceptions of management. They reveal a reorientation in transformed schools from control to empowerment.

Institutional Level

Most analysts of the institutional level of schooling--the interface of the school with its larger (generally immediate) environment--argue that the public monopoly approach to education led to "the belief in almost complete separation of schools from the community and, in turn, discouragement of local community involvement in decision making related to the administration of schools." (Burke, 1992, p. 33). Indeed, a considerable body of literature suggests that one of the major functions of bureaucracy is the buffering of the school from the environment, especially from parents and community members (Meyer & Rowan, 1975).

Many chroniclers of the changing institutional arrangements envision the demise of schooling as a sheltered government monopoly heavily controlled by professionals. In its stead, they forecast the emergence of a system of schooling and improvement designs driven by economic and political forces that substantially increase the saliency of the market. Embedded in this conception are a number of interesting dynamics, all of which gain force from a realignment of power and influence between professional educators and consumers. The most important is that the traditional dominant relationship--with professional educators on the playing field and parents on the sidelines acting as cheerleaders or agitators, or, more likely, passive spectators--is replaced by rules that advantage the consumer.

Four elements of this emerging portrait of transformed governance for consumers are most prevalent: choice in selecting a school, voice in school governance, partnership in the education of their children, and enhanced membership in the school community. Central to all four is a blurring of the boundaries between the home and the school, between the school and the community, and between professional staff and lay constituents. Collectively, these

components lend support to the grassroots political and competitive economic arguments that support the calls for more locally controlled organizations and to market-anchored conceptions of schooling.

The Changing Nature of Leadership

A number of issues about leadership begin to emerge from the discussion to date. The most important is that these fundamental shifts in the context of education and the internal dynamics of schooling require reconstructed views of the role of school managers. Leaders will have much to say about how schools respond to the changing political, social, and economic climates that characterize the nation. Likewise, leaders will be influential in the struggle to create communities where hierarchy now reigns and to reconstruct the core technology of schooling so that the promise of meaningful learning is a possibility for everyone. This section sketches a picture of leadership for tomorrow's schools. Because "changing our metaphors is an important prerequisite for developing a new theory of management and a new leadership practice" (Sergiovanni, 1991, p. 68), we describe school leadership for the 21st century by using metaphors that portray fundamental shifts in our conception of school administration, metaphors that convey changes from what leadership is today to what leadership needs to be in tomorrow's schools.

Leader as Community Servant

If there is an all-encompassing challenge for administrators of tomorrow's schools, it is to lead the transition from the bureaucratic model of schooling, with its emphasis on minimal levels of education for many, to a postindustrial adaptive model, with the goal of educating all youngsters well. The first challenge, then, is to reorient administration toward leadership and

to do so in ways consistent with the principles of postindustrial organizations. Reform reports confirm a rather deep leadership void in schools. Administration has evolved to meet the clerical needs of schools, and nearly all of the forces exerted on the administrative role over the last 150 years, including the recent round of decentralized reforms, have reinforced the administrative nature of the position. Bureaucratic schools require managers and shape the activities of the men and (to a lesser extent) women who occupy their administrative roles accordingly. Competent management, however, is likely to prove insufficient to meet the challenges of leading schools into a new age.

The leadership challenge is quite complex and formidable (Bolman & Deal, 1993). Not only must those in management roles accept the mantle of leadership--changing from implementors to initiators, from a focus on process to a concern for outcomes, from risk avoiders and conflict managers to risk takers--but they must also adopt leadership strategies and styles that are in harmony with the central tenets of the heterarchical school organizations they seek to create. They must learn to lead not from the apex of the organizational pyramid but from the nexus of a web of interpersonal relationships--with people rather than through them. Their base of influence must be professional expertise and moral imperative rather than line authority. They must learn to lead by empowering rather than by controlling others. "Participative management and staff ownership for change" (Earley, Baker, & Weindling, 1990, p. 9) are central constructs in participative leadership.

Servant leadership will differ from more traditional views of management in a number of other ways as well. Establishing meaning--rather than directing, controlling, and supervising--are at the core of this type of leadership. "Empowering leadership is based on

dialogue and cooperative, democratic leadership principles" (Bolin, 1989, p. 86). Enabling leadership also has a softer, less heroic hue. It is more ethereal and less direct: Symbolic, spiritual, and cultural leadership are key leadership forces. There is as much heart as head in this style of leading. It is grounded more upon teaching than upon informing, more upon learning than upon knowing, and more upon modeling and clarifying values and beliefs than upon telling people what to do. At the heart of servant leadership are relationships built on trust. It is more reflective and self-critical than bureaucratic management.

Leader as Organizational Architect

As we noted above, there is a fair amount of agreement that existing organizational structures and arrangements contribute to the problems that currently confront schools, that these conditions either support or cause the educational negligence that often characterizes the schooling enterprise.

What is clear from this analysis, and from our earlier discussion of organization and management for tomorrow's schools, is that if schooling is to be reformed--in short, if all youngsters are truly to be well-educated--then the organizational and governance structures of the current system will need to be systemically reconfigured. Leaders for tomorrow's schools will face the great challenge of helping define and breathe life into these new forms of governance, organization, and leadership. The work will be neither easy nor comfortable.

In becoming organizational architects, tomorrow's leaders must replace a traditional focus on stability with a focus on change. They will need to function less as classical managers and more as change agents. Tomorrow's leaders will need to disavow tenets of organizing consistent with bureaucracies (controlling, directing, supervising, evaluating, and so

forth) and embrace those principles associated with heterarchies (cooperation, empowerment, community, participation, and so forth).

The specific challenge, then, is to use these new principles of organization in service of the creation of adaptive and organic forms for schooling. These new structures need to promote the development of a professional work place. Even more important, construction of new forms must advance from blueprints based on our best knowledge of student learning. We now know that "the organization of schooling appears to proceed as if we had no relevant knowledge regarding the development of children and youth" (Goodlad, 1984, p. 323). Thus the "main challenge facing educational leaders is . . . to reconstruct conceptions of authority, status, and school structure to make them instrumental to our most powerful conceptions of teaching and learning" (Elmore, 1990, p. 63).

Leader as Social Architect

At a 1990 conference on Reinventing School Leadership sponsored by the National Center for Educational Leadership, educational scholars from across the nation underscored the need for leaders of tomorrow's schools to address the rapidly changing complexion of society, to come to terms with the changing social context of education that we outlined above. Some analysts approach these changes in terms of the family, others in terms of demographics, and still others under the larger rubric of diversity. All of them reinforce the central message presented earlier: The social fabric is changing. Society is becoming increasingly populated by persons of color and people from linguistically different groups. The citizenry is aging and becoming more mobile. Income is being distributed less equitably.

The "condition of the family" is changing so that an increasing "number of children come from homes without strong support systems" (Shakeshaft, 1990, p. 147).

The task then is to reshape schooling completely in order to address these needs and problems. Exacerbating the situation is the fact that, up to this point, we have largely failed the challenge. Schools, as Tyack (1974) reminds us, "have rarely taught the children of the poor effectively--and this failure has been systemic, not idiosyncratic" (p. 11). If our response in the future is no more successful, the result is likely to be the emergence of a dual-class society not unlike that found in many third-world countries. As with many other social issues, schools will have a good deal to say about the adequacy of society's response. School leaders, in turn, will play a significant role in determining whether the efforts of our schools are successful or not.

The metaphor of administrator as social architect has clear implications for the role of leaders in the 21st century: the leadership challenge in this instance is to develop more responsive schools. While the specifics are not yet clearly discernable, the overall solution strategy for tomorrow's leaders is clear: "They must invent and implement ways to make schools into living places that fit children rather than continuing to operate schools for 'good kids' who adapt to the existing structure" (Clark, 1990, p. 26). A second challenge to administrators is to exercise leverage over institutional structures and arrangements, such as ability grouping and tracking, that disproportionately disadvantage students in slower groups and in non-academic tracks--tracks overrepresented by low-income pupils, students of color, and other at-risk youth. Finally, because schools must provide an increasing percentage of the basic human support students need, school leaders in their role as social architects in the

postindustrial age must see schooling as one element of a larger attack on the problems facing youth. Environmental leadership and boundary management take on added importance. They will need more effectively to "bring together the home/family and school in a concerted effort to enhance the quality of education" (Hinojosa, 1990, p. 81). They will also need to be at the forefront of efforts to design and construct an integrated social agency network to address the conditions confronting many of their pupils and their families. Given its centrality in the community and the political and economic environment described earlier, the school may well find itself at the hub of this network. Thus school leaders in a postindustrial society will be busy not only redesigning the purposes and structures of their own institutions to better service our changing student population but also developing integrated networks of services with other groups.

Leader as Moral Educator

We have noted elsewhere that both the educational and value dimensions of leadership have atrophied since the formative era of school administration when superintendents were thought of as philosopher-educators. Throughout most of this century, the field has gravitated toward conceptions of leadership based on scientific images of business management and social science research. There is an expanding acknowledgment of limitations of this conception of educational leadership and a growing belief that the pendulum must swing back.

The metaphor of the administrator as moral educator takes on many forms. At its root are two fundamental beliefs: that "the deep significance of the task of the school administrator is to be found in the pedagogic ground of its vocation" (Evans, 1991, p. 17) and that "the new science of administration will be a science with values and of values"

(Greenfield, 1988, p. 155). Thus at the most basic level, there is an emerging consensus that educational administration must find its rationale in the educative process of schooling and that with a postindustrial reformation of education, a reconceptualization of school administration is in order.

As moral educators, leaders of tomorrow's schools will need to be much more heavily invested in establishing purposes than simply in managing existing arrangements. Moral leadership means that tomorrow's school administrators must engage parents, teachers, and students in reinterpreting and placing new priorities on guiding values for education and in reconstructing organizational structures and arrangements so that they match the desired educational goals and values of the school community.

The pedagogic dimensions of moral leadership are also becoming more clearly defined. Tomorrow's leaders must ensure that schools provide students with a more complex and demanding educational experience than ever before. At the same time, they must reach a large portion of the students who have not experienced success even under less demanding standards and expectations. To accomplish this, leaders in a postindustrial society will need to be much more committed to education and invested in children than they have been previously. The challenge for tomorrow's leaders will be "to refocus the structure [of schooling] on some new conception of teaching and learning" (Elmore, 1990, p. 63), and to be much more knowledgeable about the core technology of education in particular. Instructional and curricular leadership must be at the forefront of leadership skills, and administrators must maintain a focus on teaching and learning in the school. In a rather

dramatic shift from current practice, school and district leaders in tomorrow's schools will be asked to exercise intellectual leadership not as head teachers but as head learners.

The belief that the activities of administrators are deeply intertwined with critical and ethical issues is central to the metaphor of administration as moral educational leadership. As we have seen, this belief means sensitivity to the goal of equal educational opportunity. In tangible terms, it suggests changing schooling to be responsive to the needs of historically disenfranchised and undereducated pupils rather than attempting to mold children to fit currently dysfunctional organizational forms; it calls for us to examine current arrangements from a critical viewpoint, to educate the whole child, and to ensure success for all students.

The centrality of values for administrators for the 21st century is clearly evident in the call for leadership of the school community (Beck & Murphy, 1996; Murphy, 1994). In their role as transformative leaders, school heads are being asked to nurture the development of learning, professional, and caring communities based on the values of reflective inquiry and democratic participation. In developing learning communities, tomorrow's leaders must promote an atmosphere of inquiry. Particular attention must be given to examining organizational values that provide meaning to community activity. Our earlier comments about the administrator as head learner are relevant here as well.

In developing democratic, professional communities, tomorrow's leaders must operate from moral authority based on ability, commitment to the values of the school and to meeting the best interests of the children in their schools, and the courage to do what is needed. In working with others, they must widen the circle of participation in schools, focus on collaboration and shared decision making, and enhance self-efficacy among organizational

members. Finally, in facilitating the development of a caring community, leaders need to demonstrate the ethic of care to all members of the school community.

The ISLLC Standards

The Consortium decided to focus on the development of standards for several reasons. First, based on the work on standards in other arenas of educational reform, such as the efforts of the Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium, we were convinced that standards provided an especially appropriate and particularly powerful leverage point for reform. Second, we found a major void in this area of educational administration--a set of common standards for school leaders across all levels was conspicuous by its absence. Finally, we believed that the standards approach provided the best avenue to allow diverse stakeholders to drive improvement efforts along a variety of fronts: licensure, certification, program approval, candidate assessment, and so forth. We also believed that we would be advantaged in the standards-development work if we could tease out central tenets that should shape our work and could operate from a set of overarching guiding principles. In this section, we outline all three defining elements of our work--the central tenets, the principles, and the standards themselves (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996).

Central Tenets

1. There is a single set of standards that applies to all leadership positions.

We acknowledge the great diversity of requirements for leadership positions in America's schools and school districts. In important ways, being a high school principal is different from being an elementary school principal or a district superintendent. We also are

well aware of the importance of context in shaping the expectations facing school leaders. There are real differences in the demands confronting an elementary school principal in a core city and one in a suburban town. Acknowledging these important issues, however, does not gainsay the Consortium's position that the heart and soul of effective leadership is similar for almost all school administrators.

2. The focus and ground of the standards should be the heart and soul of productive leadership.

We determined early on that the Consortium's standards-development work would be informed primarily by knowledge about schools that were effective in educating all youngsters and information about the role of school leaders in guiding and directing these productive schools. This conclusion led us logically to two further decisions. First, issues of teaching and learning and school improvement would be featured in the standards. Second, parsimony in the framing process was to be desired. Our experiences in schools and districts, state educational agencies, and universities convinced us that the actor we worked hard to position on center stage--learning and teaching yoked to student performance--would quickly get displaced if we populated the stage with all the relevant players who could make legitimate claims to space. We viewed this possibility with considerable alarm. We consciously decided, therefore, not to have the standards attend to every function and aspect of a leader's job. We privileged those dimensions that focused on shaping and directing the core technology. Also, those dimensions of the job that traditionally have not been tightly linked to learning and teaching were recast in the service of school improvement and student performance.

3. The standards should not simply codify what is; they should help push and pull the profession to a higher level.

As we have noted in other venues, there is considerable room for improvement across the profession of school administration in general and in the ways we think about educational leadership specifically. At the same time, as noted in an earlier section of this paper, we were convinced that the prevailing conception of schooling is undergoing important changes and that deep-seated views of leadership need to be reconfigured to come into line with those changes. For these reasons, we concluded that standards-development work that proceeded by mapping the existing leadership terrain would not be wise. Examining current domains of responsibility and partitioning out the multi-faceted elements of the job would, we came to believe, both advantage the status quo in the profession (which we judged as an undesirable state) and push issues of learning and teaching to a distant corner of the profession (where they have lain fallow for much of the last 75 years). We turned our attention, instead, to the picture of what a strengthened profession of school leadership might look like and, while still honoring the realities of the existing workplace, pegged the standards to that vision.

Principles

A set of guiding principles, closely connected to the above-noted tenets, also was crafted at the outset of the Consortium's standards-development work. We developed these principles primarily to guide our thinking in the development process. Over time, we saw that these principles actually could serve two functions. First, they acted as a touchstone to which we regularly returned to test the scope and focus of emerging products. Second, they

helped give meaning to the standards--and the indicators that define the standards. Here are the seven principles that helped orient all of our work:

- Standards should reflect the centrality of student learning.
- Standards should acknowledge the changing role of the school leader.
- Standards should recognize the collaborative nature of school leadership.
- Standards should be high, upgrading the quality of the profession.
- Standards should inform performance-based systems of assessment and evaluation for school leaders.
- Standards should be integrated and coherent.
- Standards should be predicated on the concepts of access, opportunity, and empowerment for all members of the school community.

Standards

The ISLLC standards that emerged from the development process are:

- A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.
- A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.
- A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

- A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.
- A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.
- A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

In most ways, the standards speak for themselves. What is missing in this abbreviated report, however, are the roughly 200 indicators that help define the standards. They are clustered under three headers for each standard--knowledge, dispositions, and performances. We borrowed this template from our sister organization, INTASC, who created it while engaged in a parallel process of standards development for teachers. While there was little debate about the importance of knowledge and performances in the framework, the inability to "assess" dispositions caused some of us a good deal of consternation at the outset of the project. As we became more enmeshed in the work, however, we discovered that the dispositions often occupied center stage. That is, because "dispositions are the proclivities that lead us in one direction rather than another within the freedom of action that we have" (Perkins, 1995, p. 275), in many fundamental ways they nourish and give meaning to performance. Over time, we grew to understand that these elements--knowledge, dispositions, and performances--belonged together. We also found ourselves agreeing with Perkins that

"dispositions are the soul of intelligence, without which the understanding and know-how do little good" (p. 278).

The ISLLC Standards at Work

The ISLLC standards and indicators were forged with the intent of strengthening school leadership in a variety of ways, e.g., by improving the quality of programs that prepare school leaders and ensuring greater accountability for the efforts of these programs; by upgrading and bringing greater coherence to professional development for school leaders; by creating a framework to better assess candidates for licensure and relicensure; by establishing a foundation on which certification programs can be constructed. They were designed to be used by school districts, state agencies, and professional associations. Although they have been adopted only recently (November 1996) and no systematic data collection has been completed to date on their use, we are seeing evidence that the standards are being employed in a variety of ways--examples of which are provided below.

Standards development. A number of states and professional associations are using the ISLLC framework to develop their own standards. In some cases (e.g., Illinois, Ohio, and the New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association), the ISLLC standards have been adopted whole cloth. In other places (e.g., Mississippi, Louisiana, and the Texas Superintendents Association), they have served as the raw material from which state standards were crafted. Similar development and benchmarking work is underway in a variety of other venues (e.g., Iowa's professional standards board--the Iowa Board of Educational Examiners).

District and association-based new leaders' academies. The standards are sometimes being used by school districts and professional associations to help develop programs to

identify and grow potential school leaders. For example, the Alabama Council of School Administration and Supervision has grounded their new professional development program for prospective school site leaders on the ISLLC standards.

Principal evaluation. While our information here is exceedingly thin, we expect that a number of parties will follow the lead of districts like Highland Park, Illinois, and states like Louisiana in using the standards as an evaluative template for school principals.

Preparation program redesign. Considerable energy is being devoted to linking the ISLLC standards to the reform of formal training programs for school administrators. Some guidance in this area is beginning to appear in the professional literature (e.g., Van Meter & Murphy, 1997). Curricular materials that flow from the standards are beginning to surface as well (e.g., the new volume by William Sharp and his colleagues (1997) entitled Case Studies for School Leaders: Implementing the ISLLC Standards. Preparation redesign efforts are also afoot throughout the country. These efforts run the gamut from individual universities (e.g., Towson State University, Maryland), to cooperative cross-university activities (e.g., Missouri professors association), to whole-state reform initiatives (e.g., North Carolina, Mississippi, Louisiana). This latter category represents a particularly robust use of the standards. The general strategy is to ask all colleges and universities in a state to reconstruct their training programs to align with the new standards. After a development period, usually 12 to 18 months, a national review panel is engaged to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the redesigned programs. Universities that score well have their programs reauthorized. Those programs that do not receive passing grades are either sent back for the institution to address

noted deficiencies (e.g., Mississippi) or the institution's charter to prepare school administrators is withdrawn (e.g., North Carolina).

Program accreditation. In addition to type of program approval noted above, at least one state (Mississippi) is linking program accreditation with passing rates of students taking the new interstate licensure examination for school leaders--which we describe more fully below.

Professional development. States (e.g., Rhode Island) and professional associations (e.g., Illinois Elementary Principals Association) are also bringing the standards to bear on the continuing education of school leaders. In addition, through the Consortium, 30 states and all the major, relevant professional associctions are creating a standards-based portfolio for professional development.

Licensure. The most visible use of the standards to date--the one spotlighted in this symposium (and in the forthcoming special issue of JPEE)--has been in the area of assessment for licensure. In a unique partnership, the Educational Testing Service and five states (Illinois, Kentucky, Missouri, Mississippi, North Carolina) and the District of Columbia are developing comprehensive performance-based examinations for licensure. One notable element of this partnership is the collaborative effort to yoke powerful methodologies on performance-based assessment with the standards designed to shape leadership for tomorrow's schools. The result will be tools for improvement across the profession.

The first phase has been the development of an assessment battery to evaluate the extent to which prospective leaders can apply knowledge in the service of school improvement. The second phase focuses on developing specifications and prototypes for

portfolios that meet the same objective for current administrators. The assessment for initial licensure is a six-hour examination organized into two, two-hour modules and two one-hour modules. All the exercises require written responses, and as with other professions, assessments are scored by practitioners. Expert scorers judge the candidate responses using a rubric based on the ISLLC standards and multiple sample candidate responses. The first phase of the assessment comes on line in October of 1998. In addition to the states noted above, Maryland has also opted to use this examination for licensure. Additional states such as Ohio, Tennessee, and Connecticut are likely to adopt this examination within the next few months. A licensure test for superintendents is also being discussed.

Relicensure. A few states (e.g., Missouri) anticipate using the portfolio instrument noted above under professional development to relicense principals.

Certification. The three professional associations with the closet links to practice (AASA, NAESP, and NASSP) have opened discussions about developing a system of professional certification for leaders. The ISLLC standards form part of the platform they plan to use in constructing the certification system.

Notes

1. The infrastructure sections are taken from J. Murphy, The Landscape of Leadership Preparation: Reframing the Education of School Administrators, Corwin Press, 1992.

References

Beck, L. G., & Murphy, J. (1996). The four imperatives of school improvement. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Bolin, F. S. (1989, Fall). Empowering leadership. Teachers College Record, 19(1), 81-96.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1993). Everyday epistemology in school leadership: Patterns and prospects. In P. Hallinger, K. Leithwood, & J. Murphy (Eds.), Cognitive perspectives on educational leadership. New York: Teachers College Press.

Burke, C. (1992). Devolution of responsibility to Queensland schools: Clarifying the rhetoric critiquing the reality. Journal of Educational Administration, 30(4), 33-52.

Campbell, R. F., Fleming, T., Newell, L., & Bennion, J. W. (1987). A history of thought and practice in educational administration. New York: Teachers College Press.

Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development. (1989). Turning points. Washington, DC: Author.

Clark, D. L. (1990, September). Reinventing school leadership (Working memo prepared for the Reinventing School Leadership Conference, pp. 25-29). Cambridge, MA: National Center for Educational Leadership.

Consortium on Productivity in the Schools. (1995). Using what we have to get the schools we need. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, The Institute on Education and the Economy.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1996). The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium: Standards for School Leaders. Washington, DC: Author.

Earley, P., Baker, L., & Weindling, D. (1990). "Keeping the raft afloat": Secondary headship five years on. National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales.

Elmore, R. F. (1990, September). Reinventing school leadership. Working memo prepared for the Reinventing School Leadership Conference (pp. 62-65). Cambridge, MA: National Center for Educational Leadership.

Evans, R. (1991, April). Ministrative insight: Educational administration as pedagogic practice. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Fisher, C. W. (1990, January). The Research Agenda Project as prologue. Journal of Research in Mathematics Education, 21(1), 81-89.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Greenfield, T. B. (1988). The decline and fall of science in educational administration. In D. E. Griffith, R. T. Stout, & P. B. Forsyth (Eds.), Leaders for America's schools (pp. 131-159). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Hawley, W. D. (1989). Looking backward at education reform. Education Week, 9(9), 23, 35.

Hinojosa, D. (1990, September). Reinventing school leadership. Working memo prepared for the Reinventing School Leadership Conference (pp. 80-84). Cambridge, MA: National Center for Educational Leadership.

Hutchins, C. L. (1988). Design as the missing piece in education. In Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, The redesign of education: A collection of

papers concerned with comprehensive educational reform (Vol. 1., pp. 47-49). San Francisco: Far West Laboratory.

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1975). Notes on the structure of educational organizations: Revised version. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco.

Murnane, R. J., & Levy, F. (1996). Teaching the new basic skills: Principles for educating children to thrive in a changing economy. New York: The Free Press.

Murphy, J. (1994). Transformational change and the evolving role of the principalship: Early empirical evidence. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts (pp. 20-53). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. (1987). Leaders for America's schools. Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration.

Perkins, D. (1995). Outsmarting I.Q.: The Emerging Science of Learnable Intelligence. New York: The Free Press.

Petrie, H. G. (1990). Reflecting on the second wave of reform: Restructuring the teaching profession. In S. L. Jacobson & J. A. Conway (Eds.), Educational leadership in an age of reform (pp. 14-29). New York: Longman.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1991). The principalship: A reflective practice perspective (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Shakeshaft, C. (1990, September). Reinventing school leadership. Working memo prepared for the Reinventing School Leadership Conference (pp. 147-150). Cambridge, MA: National Center for Educational Leadership.

Sharp, W. L., Walter, J. K., & Sharp, H. M. (1997). Case studies for school leaders. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.

Tyack, D. B. (1974). The one best system: A history of American urban education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tyack, D. (1993). School governance in the United States: Historical puzzles and anomalies. In J. Hannaway & M. Carnoy (Eds.), Decentralization and school improvement (pp. 1-32). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Van Meter, E., & Murphy, J. (1997). Using ISLLC standards to strengthen preparation programs in school administration. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Wise, A. E. (1989). Professional teaching: A new paradigm for the management of education. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. H. Moore (Eds.), Schooling for tomorrow: Directing reforms to issues that count (pp. 301-310). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.